

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 13-15, 17-18 remain in this application. Claims 2, 3, 7, 11, 12 and 16 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 15 and 17 have been amended. Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs 24, 26 and 34 of the specification.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, a destination number including a feature activation code, a series of numbers representing a URL for a Web site, and a special code to signal the end of the URL as well as the step of releasing the call when the local switch recognizes that a special code has been entered by the caller.

Applicant submits that neither *Berstis* nor *Sylvain* discloses at least the aforementioned features of independent claim 1. In particular, it is submitted that the primary citation to *Berstis* does not disclose the claimed destination number or releasing step. Accordingly, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combination, the asserted combination of *Berstis* and *Sylvain* is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

The primary citation to *Berstis* relates to a method for enabling a user having access to a telephone device to browse the Internet without a Web browser. Using the telephone device, the user enters information identifying a given URL. (*Berstis*, FIG. 4 and column 4, lines 20-65.) The input information is then supplied to the Web browser, which fetches the desired page.

The Office Action contends that the method described as being used to access the Internet through a conventional telephone meets the aforementioned features of independent claim 1. (Office Action, page 2-3). This contention is respectfully traversed.

Berstis, at column 4, lines 35-52, expressly teaches that only the URL is input. There is no mention of a special code to signal the end of the URL. Thus, *Berstis* cannot reasonably be interpreted to disclose the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1.

The secondary citation to *Sylvain* relates to a combined user agent (CUA) to represent a telephony device supported by a private branch exchange (PBX), which is connected to a public domain telephony switch, and a packet-based media device

as an integrated group to other network entities and is cited for its alleged disclosure of receiving a destination number at a local switch. (Office Action, page 3). Applicant submits that *Sylvain* does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency in *Berstis*.

Further, the Office Action concedes that neither *Berstis* nor *Sylvain* disclose releasing the call when the local switch recognizes that the caller has entered a special code. Nonetheless, the Office Action contends that the further citation to *Greenberg* provides this necessary disclosure. (Office Action, page 4). This contention is respectfully traversed.

Greenberg relates to Internet telephony for e-commerce. *Greenberg*, at paragraph 70, expressly teaches that the caller may terminate the call by pushing a “hang up” button or by closing the internet telephony browser window. There is no mention of the caller entering a special code to signal the end of the call. Thus, *Greenberg* cannot reasonably be interpreted to disclose the aforementioned feature of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

The arguments set forth above apply equally as well to independent claim 10, as amended. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is respectfully submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1, 4-6, 8-10, 13-15, 17-18) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to telephone John S. Zanghi, at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP

John S. Zanghi

John S. Zanghi
Reg. No. 48,843
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
216-861-5582

1/18/08
Date

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
- ☒ transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.
- ☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature <i>Elaine M. Checovich</i>
Date <i>1-18-08</i>	Printed Name Elaine M. Checovich

N:\LUTZ\200281\emc0006685V001.docx